APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,733	01/16/2002	Paul Barry Pershan	Verizon-23	7734

32127	7590	09/20/2005

EXAMINER
LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2664	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/050,733	PERSHAN, PAUL BARRY
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew C. Lee	2664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 January 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _01/16/2002_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, "the call screening information includes bandwidth information" as disclosed in claim 6; "the call screening information includes language information" as disclosed in claim 7 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2.   New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this

application because the referenced subject matters and numbers on the top of the

drawings for Fig. 3, Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 are not clear and cannot be read. Applicant

is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office,

as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The

corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of

the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3.   The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to

determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. 6909708 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of a method of

servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled to

an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, elements 1021,1050,; column 84, lines 40 –

57), the telephone call being placed from a telephone device coupled to a public

telephone network by dialing a first telephone number associated with the Internet

Protocol telephony device (column 84, lines 40 – 57), the method comprising the steps

of activating a trigger set at a telephone switch included in said public telephone

network, the trigger being responsive to calls received by said telephone switch directed

to said first telephone number; pausing call processing at said telephone switch in

response to activation of said trigger (column 85, lines 8 – 23); accessing a database

maintained in said Internet Protocol network to obtain there from information associated

with the first telephone number; and controlling completion of said call by said telephone

switch as a function of the information obtained from said database (column 92, lines 38

– 63).

Regarding claim 2, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of

claimed wherein the obtained information includes call forwarding information (column

28, lines 23 – 30; column 80, lines 64 – 67; column 81, lines 1 – 9); and wherein the

step of controlling completion of said call includes operating said telephone switch to

route said call using a telephone number included in the obtained information (column

82, lines 40 – 49).

Regarding claim 3, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes call forwarding information (column 28, lines 23 – 30; column 80, lines 64 – 67; column 81, lines 1 – 9).

Regarding claim 4, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes an Internet Protocol address; and wherein the step of controlling completion of said call includes operating said first telephone call to route said call using the IP address included in the obtained information (column 81, lines 2 – 9; lines 16 – 19; column 92, lines 50 – 58).

Regarding claim 5, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes call screening information (column 68, lines 43 – 48); and wherein the step of controlling completion of said call includes terminating said call without completing it to said telephone number when said call screening information indicates that the call will not be completed successfully by the Internet Protocol network to the Internet telephony device corresponding to the called number (column 68, lines 48 – 64).

Regarding claim 6, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the call screening information includes bandwidth information (Fig. 64, column 13, lines 63 – 67; column 14, lines 1 – 8).

Regarding claim 7, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the call screening information includes language information (column 74, lines 17 – 27; column 76, lines 6 – 19).

Regarding claim 8, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the call screening information includes calling party telephone number Information (column 68, lines 43 – 48; column 244, lines 41 – 58).

Regarding claim 9, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein said trigger is an advanced intelligent network trigger (column 18, lines 15- 23; column 112, lines 1 – 5; lines 45 – 52), the method further comprising the step of pausing call processing at said switch following activation of said trigger; and sending a message to a service control point located in said public switched telephone network, the service control point performing said accessing step (column 112, lines 1 – 5; lines 45 – 52).

Regarding claims 10, 14, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database (column 54, lines 60 – 64).

Regarding claim 11, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein said telephone switch is a gateway switch which interconnects said public telephone network with the Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, column 23, lines 30 – 34), the method further comprising, for calls completed to said Internet Protocol telephony device operating the gateway switch to generate Internet Protocol packets corresponding to said telephone call (Fig. 10A; column 23, lines 30 – 34; lines 51 – 67); and transmitting said generated Internet Protocol packets to the Internet Protocol

network for delivery to said Internet Protocol telephony device (column 85, lines 13 –

17; column 92, lines 50 – 58).

Regarding claim 13, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method of

claimed wherein said device in said Internet Protocol network which is contacted is a

domain name server (column 81, lines 16 – 19).

Regarding claim 16, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of a communications

system for processing telephone calls, the communications system comprising: an

Internet Protocol network for routing calls transmitted using Internet Protocol packets to

Internet Protocol telephony devices, the Internet Protocol network including a database

of Internet Protocol telephone device telephone numbers and associated information

(Fig. 10A, column 89, lines 18 – 68; column 90, lines 1 –2); a telephone switch including

a trigger set to detect telephone calls directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device

coupled to the Internet Protocol network (Fig. 1C, column 89, lines 18 – 25); a service

control point coupled to said telephone switch, the service control point including: i)

means for accessing said database of Internet Protocol telephone device telephone

numbers and associated information in response to a message received from the

telephone switch relating to a telephone call activating said trigger (column 91, lines 17

– 31); and ii) control logic for generating call completion instructions as a function of

information obtained from said database (column 91, lines 29 – 34).

Regarding claim 17, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the

communication system of claimed wherein the means for accessing said database

includes a Session Initiation Protocol interface (column 54, lines 60 – 64).

Regarding claim 18, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the communications system of claim wherein said database includes call screening information (column 244, lines 41 – 58).

Regarding claim 19, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the communication system of claimed wherein said database includes call forwarding information (column 28, lines 23 – 30; column 80, lines 64 – 67; column 81, lines 1 – 9).

Regarding claim 21, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the communications system of claimed wherein said database includes Internet Protocol addresses corresponding to the telephone numbers included in the database (column 92, lines 51 – 58).

Regarding claim 22, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the communications system of claimed wherein said trigger is an advanced intelligent network trigger (column 18, lines 15- 23; column 112, lines 1 – 5; lines 45 – 52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. 6909708 B1) in view of Foti et al. (U.S. 6917612 B2).

Regarding claim 12, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of a method of

servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled to

an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, elements 1021,1050; column 84, lines 40 – 57),

Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing

said database to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible

for retrieving information from said database (column 92, lines 50 – 58). Krishnaswamy

et al. does not disclose expressly the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing

said database includes using Enum to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network

which is responsible for retrieving information from said database. Foti et al. discloses

the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database

includes using Enum to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is

responsible for retrieving information from said database (column 4, lines 12 – 30). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Krishnaswamy et al to include a method of claimed wherein the step of

accessing said database includes using Enum to contact a device in said Internet

Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database such

as that taught by Foti et al. in order to have a system and method of address resolution

in IP-based networks that provides a uniform methodology for address resolution (as

suggested by Foti et al. , see column 3, lines 17 – 20).

Regarding claim 15, Regarding claim 12, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses

the limitation of a method of servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol

telephony device coupled to an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, elements

1021,1050; column 84, lines 40 – 57), Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the method of

claimed wherein the step of accessing said database to contact a device in said Internet

Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database

(column 92, lines 50 – 58). Krishnaswamy et al. does not disclose expressly the

limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database

includes using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a device in said Internet

Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database ( ).

Foti et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of

accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a

device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information

from said database (column 4, lines 12 – 30). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy et al

to include a method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes

using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a device in said Internet Protocol

network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database such as that

taught by Foti et al. in order to have a system and method of address resolution in IP-

based networks that provides a uniform methodology for address resolution (as

suggested by Foti et al. , see column 3, lines 17 – 20).

Regarding claim 20, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of a method of

servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled to

an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, elements 1021,1050; column 84, lines 40 – 57),

Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the communications system of claim 17, wherein the

means for accessing said database includes an interface (column 92, lines 50 – 58). Krishnaswamy et al. does not disclose expressly Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the communications system of claim 17, wherein the means for accessing said database includes an ENUM interface. Foti et al. discloses the limitation of the communications system of claim 17, wherein the means for accessing said database includes an ENUM interface (column 4, lines 12 – 30; column 5, lines 20 – 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy et al to include the communications system of claim 17, wherein the means for accessing said database includes an ENUM interface such as that taught by Foti et al. in order to have a system and method of address resolution in IP-based networks that provides a uniform methodology for address resolution (as suggested by Foti et al., see column 3, lines 17 – 20).

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

                                                                                 Ajit Patel
ACL   Aug 28,2005   Primary Examiner